DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 081 CG 008 189

AUTHOR	Lowe, Joseph M.
TITLE	Improving Interpersonal Relationships among Senior High School Students in A Recently Desegregated School.
INSTITUTION	Alachua County School Board, Gainesville, Fla.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-1-D-071
PUB DATE	Jun 73
GRANT	OEG-4-72-0012
NOTE	76p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Changing Attitudes; *Group Guidance; *High School Students; Interpersonal Relationship; Multimedia Instruction; Public Schools; *Racial Attitudes; *School Integration; Self Concept; Values
IDENTIFIERS	Social Distance Scale; Tennessee Self Concept Scale

ABSTRACT

This pilot project tests the effectiveness of group process techniques and value clarification strategies for changing attitudes of senior high school students participating in a curriculum involving extensive media utilization. Specifically, the study provides opportunities for students: (1) to examine alternatives and to talk about the values and consequences of those finally selected; and (2) to examine the similarities and differences of people, particularly those in racial and religious subcultures. The study involves 30 black students and 30 white students who attended five seminars featuring a free exchange of ideas and feelings. The seminars used books, taped programs, field trips, log books, and value sheets in their instructional approach. Subjects were administered the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Social Distance Scale before and after the seminars. Results show that the program achieved some success in modifying attitudes toward self and others. (Author/LAA)

ED 082081

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: CG TM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

FINAL REPORT

GROUP NO. OEG - 4 - 72 - 0012
PROJECT 1 - D - 071

Joseph M. Lowe
Alachua County School Board
East University Avenue
Gainesville, Florida

Improving Interpersonal Relationships among Senior High School Students in a Recently Desegregated School

June 1973

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 008 189

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Improving Interpersonal Relationships
in a Recently Desegregated High School

Pilot project designed to test the effectiveness of group process techniques and value clarification strategies for changing attitudes of students participating in a curriculum involving extensive media utilization and field trips.

The points of view and the contents of this report express the view of their research team and not necessarily those of any other person or institution.

J. M. Lowe

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RATIONALE

OBJECTIVES

PROCEDURE

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES

OBSERVATIONAL

INSTRUCTIONAL ORGANIZATION, STRATEGIES AND EQUIPMENT

SPECIAL MATERIALS

EVALUATION

CONCLUSION

FISCAL REPORT

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDIX

RATIONALE

In the process of integrating the schools, youth is on the "firing line" --unarmed. They have not been provided with the necessary planned opportunities to grow in the understandings, attitudes, and skills needed to identify the problem, to examine the alternative possible in behavior choices, to bring their own value systems to a conscious level and compare them with the value systems of others.

It is the challenge to the public school to make possible the open identification and examination of the problem and to propose and implement solutions and/or alternative behaviors. There is sufficient evidence, empirical and experimentally validated, that participants in "group process" arrangements for human interaction experience growth of understanding of themselves as well as others. There is also evidence to support the effectiveness of group process for promoting changes in attitudes and values.

The need for research to find ways to improve interpersonal relations and communication skills in intergroup activities has been noted by anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists, for many years.

In the summary of the discussions held on "Needed Research in Teaching," by NCSS and NCTE, the three research problems assigned the highest priorities were:

1. Methods and techniques for effective humanistic interaction;

2. The structure and sequence inherent on the one hand in various subject matters and skills and on the other in the maturing intelligence and abilities of the student--and their inter-relationship on the other.

3. The importance of our culture and its sub-cultures to what happens in the classroom.

Ruth G. Strickland, has noted that the child builds through language and interaction with others his concepts of himself, of others, of how people behave and why, of life on the earth, and of man's relation with man. We need to know more about the inter-relationship of values and personality, language and ideas and ideals, humanistic action and interaction.

A statement by Wendell Johnson calls ... the civilizing potential of this chorus of many tongues to the attention of those who seek to govern wisely and of those who are intent on bringing up their children, instructing their students, and fashioning their own lives with an

informed sensitivity to the demanding, but utterly essential, art of living constructively with our differences, and of nurturing all together our common promise of self-fulfillment

Rapoport noted the paradox in man's need for value structure and communication, and the difficulties inherent in handling these areas well; i.e., "mapping reality" precisely, accurately, in the following:

> The way language and behavior binds people together and strikes them asunder, the way what we say and what we do to others and to ourselves influences our attitudes toward others, toward ourselves, and toward the world.

Sophistication in the use of verbal and non-verbal communication is not an easy achievement. The best that we can hope for, and indeed this would be no small achievement if we succeeded in it, is to create a public taste for interaction that will demand directness, economy, clarity, and precision, a taste that will be impatient with blurred expression.

If we are to accomplish this, we must convey to our students the attitude that communication and interaction forms a medium which is within their power to control if they learn enough about behavior and reaction styles.

Radke-Yarrow and associates submit that, "Experimentation with methods of retraining attitudes and developing social concepts is necessary if present theories and methods which appear to be inadequate are to be followed by more effective approaches to education."

The evidence of demand for improvement of communication proficiency in human relations is overwhelming. An extensive examination of it indicates a consensus converging upon a focus of gaining knowledge about the likenesses and differences among humans and on gaining control over use of interaction skills in relating to one another.

This study is an attempt to test the effectiveness of materials and experience selected with the hope of meeting the above noted demands. Specifically, the study provides opportunities, real and vicarious, for students:

1. <u>to examine alternatives in situations and to talk about what values they hold in choosing alternatives as well as of the consequences of the various selections.</u>

2. <u>to examine likenesses and differences among people all over the world as well as those in their own families, in their</u>

own peer group, and in the racial and religious subcultures which surround them.

The findings of this study should give direction to the selection, organization, and presentation of content which can be used in developing attitudes, values, and verbal and non-verbal behavior more conducive to satisfactory human relations, both personal and intergroup.

OBJECTIVES

The over-arching objective of this pilot project is the modification of attitudes toward oneself and toward others. The purpose of this objective is both immediate and long-range. It was anticipated that improvement of attitudes toward self and others will facilitate the development of interpersonal relationships among black and white students both within and outside the experimental classes and also will contribute to academic achievement. However, the objectives selected for the pilot study are limited to the immediate focus of changing attitudes which affect the development of interpersonal relationships among black and white students.

The pilot study seeks evidence to support the following hypotheses:

Attitudes Toward Self

1. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate a greater positive shift from the beginning to the end of the semester on a self-report measure of self-concept than will control students.

   The following comparisons will be involved in testing this hypothesis: total experimental group with total control group; white experimental students with white control students; black experimental students with black control students, male experimental students with male control students, and female experimental students with female control students.

2. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate over time, increased personal involvement in activities of the experimental class and enhanced feelings of self-worth as reflected in entries in an open class log book.

3. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate over time, increased awareness of personal values as reflected in their responses to selected instructional strategies of value clarification.

Attitudes Towards Others

1. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate a greater positive shift from the beginning to the end of the semester on a self-report measure of attitudes toward others than will the control students. The attitude measure will include indices of attitudes toward those of different ethnic and religious backgrounds, of different cultural backgrounds, of varying scholastic achievement, and of different life styles.

The following comparisons will be involved in testing this hypothesis: total experimental group with total control group; white experimental students with white control students; black experimental students with black control students, male experimental students with male control students, and female experimental studetns with female control students.

2. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate over time, increasingly positive attitudes toward those who are different from themselves as reflected in entries in an open class log book.

3. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate during the semester of the experimental class, improvement in their ability to tolerate students who are different from themselves as reflected in a lower rate of referrals to deans' and counselors' offices for disruptions than that exhibited by control students.

PROCEDURE

This study was conducted in the second semester of 1971-72, beginning February 1 and ending June 30. The pilot project aimed to test a procedure designed to attack one of the most critical problems in education in the Southeast today: integration of blacks into a predominantly white school.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

The sixty (60) students, 30 white and 30 black, were accepted from the general school population on an elective basis. The 60 students treated in the investigation will include those reading as much as two or more grades below grade level and who, by teachers', counselors', and deans' reports, have demonstrated frustration and prejudice toward members of the opposite race. For treatment, a group of sixty (60) students will be enrolled in two regularly scheduled classes, meeting for approximately one hour each day. A bi-racial control group of 60 students who will receive no experimental treatment will be identified. The sixty students in the experimental group will be divided into two groups (classes) of thirty each, integrated by race and sex. Sub-groups will be structured according to emerging needs.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES

Instructional procedures were based on the premise that when collected individuals experiencing distaste, distrust, and uneasiness are provided with a safe environment in which to examine mutual problems, they not only generate some possible solutions but identify personal strengths and become more humane in their attitudes toward differences and limitations. Suspicion, distaste, and uneasiness are outcomes of ignorance. As E. T. Hall, an anthropologist, says, "...strangers disturb him, not because their mannerisms are different, but because he knows so little about them."

OBSERVATIONAL

During an early phase of the study the coordinator of research for the project gathered exploratory, observational data about the types of interpersonal interactions which were occurring in the five subgroups of the experimental class. The categories developed by Chris Argyries (1) to examine individual and interpersonal facilitative and non-facilitative behavior in groups were organized into a twelve-cell matrix. (see appendix for instrument and matrix with examples) Data gathered with this instrument, admittedly tentative, was provided to the group leaders as feedback which they might wish to discuss with their groups. Unfortunately, due to a lack of manpower

to conduct the observations, it was necessary to abandon this activity after several weeks of trial.

The finding that most discussion could be categorized as individual owning statements prompted group leaders and participants to encourage interpersonal supportive discussion and individual and interpersonal open and exploratory thinking and questioning.

ORGANIZATION FOR THE TREATMENT OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

The staff consisted of two teachers, four graduate students and resource persons such as a University specialist and the research division of the Alachua County School System. Others as needed were called upon, i. e., school counselors, deans' office and the administrative staff.

The daily working organization was to divide the experimental group of sixty into five smaller groups balanced in race and sex as in the class ratio. This selection was made by lottery with students aiding in the process. Once the groups were established the group leaders were assigned to work with each student group.

When selecting the graduate students to use the University specialist who was aiding the project was asked to recommend. We selected two males and two females, one male and one female were white , the other two were black. The reason was that all students model on adults and some of these students need their own racial models.

Once the team was established, planning sessions for the adult team were begun. Students were invited to give their input into the planning of activities. Examples of the materials resulting from these planning sessions are found in the appendix.

The five seminars established had as their most difficult task establishing a "climate" where a free exchange of feelings and ideas could take place. This proved to be most difficult for the students were dealing with a lifetime of attitudes toward each race. The result was that we were unable to carry out as many activities as we had originally designed.

A most useful aid in examining people of similar and different ethnic and attitudinal backgrounds was UTR. Examples of its use were: (1) students being able to observe themselves as they interact with others (2) taping events on campus and in the community (a major student demonstration against the renewed bombing of North Viet Nam happened

here. We had the UTR out for a series of "on the spot" interviews as a topic for seminar discussion on conflicting values.) (3) taping relevant television programs e.g., To All My Friends On Shore, Bill Cosby's dramatic special about a black family whose only son has sicle cell. (See appendix for structured use of this program.)

Books on [illegible]ch as: the black experience, American Indians, teenage problems, biographical materials of minority leaders, etc, were obtained. Most were paper backs and sutdents could take them as their own. Material concerning minorities were bought in the greater amounts for books could help minority students with poor self concepts. The interest level was rather high especially when students could find books about themselves and that reading was not required. The books selected were to enhance minority self concepts.

SOCIAL INTERACTION

Field Trips: Extensive short field trips were planned by each group at least once weekly. Examples are: Florida State Museum Indian exhibits, a working farm, picnics, games, a swimming party, a funeral home, etc. Knowledge as well as the establishment of group identity was the purpose of these trips.

Our most successful trip was a camping trip of one week's duration to Oleno State Park. As we were to miss a week of school, some of our students who had jobs after school were unable to go, however, all who wanted and could make the necessary arrangements to leave for a week were encouraged to attend. Fifteen students were able to make the trip along with one teacher and one graduate student. Our rationale was an experiment in group living away from the normal pressures of environment. We assumed that this group of eight blacks and seven whites could cooperatively live together without friction. All planning from rules of conduct, food, programs, and recreation were planned by the students. Each night we had a special program and a group discussion based on the program. A young black leader, a black counselor in the state prison system, our school principal, and a "feedback" session to evaluate the week were the programs.

The most valuable experience was the opportunity of living together and the nightly informal "rap" session. From student evaluations and adult observation this was the most successful activity of the entire program. One major conclusion must be that when students are given the opportunity to have an educational experience away from the normal environment, they are able to cooperate with a minimum of friction. Individual counseling and conducting group meetings were the responsibilities of the adults.

Each group was assigned a creative task of their own choosing. Most made films or video tapes. The content was not important for cooperative planning and group execution was stressed.

SPECIAL MATERIALS

An example of materials is Value Sheets which were used extensively. These sheets consisted of a short, controversial, and provocative statement. These statements were distributed to all participants to read and think about questions prior to discussion in groups. The purpose was to try to reach group decision. (see appendix for instructions on group decision making). The controversial value sheets were very useful in building group identity as well as being an exercise in arriving at group consensus. (sample value sheets are in appendix). The most notable aspect of these exercises was in giving these students a safe topic about which they could disagree withoug feeling threatened.

LOG BOOK

The open log was not as successful as we desired. Many of the students selected were unsure of their writing ability. These students were very vocal about their views and feelings but were unwilling to write entries. The teacher logs were essentially narative with notes and future planning indicated.

Goals for personal development is an example of the continuous self evaluation we were asking of students. This also gave us another opportunity to better plan in meeting individual student needs. (see appendix).

EVALUATION

Evaluation Design

The experimental design used in the pilot study involved pretesting and posttesting of an experimental participant group and of a comparison nonparticipant group of senior high school students. Since participation in the project was determined according to standard procedures for course enrollment, it was not possible to randomly assign students to groups. However, a reasonable balance of students was obtained in both groups with respect to factors of interest in the study - race, sex, academic orientation, and vocational orientation.

INSTRUMENTS

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale is a well-standardized, multidimensional scale which consists of one hundred (100) self descriptive statements. The scale generates twenty-nine (29) subscale scoreswhich are termed "profile variables" by the publisher. Fifteen (15) of these subscale scores were selected by project personnel for analysis.

Completed answer sheets were sent to the publisher for scoring. Data cards suitable for computer analysis and individual student printouts were returned to project staff for study and research purposes.

The following profile variables were selected for study: self-criticism, net conflict, total conflict, positive identity, positive self-satisfaction, positive behavior, physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, social self, total variability, defensive positive, general maladjustment, personality integration. Complete pre and post test scores on these indicators were obtained for eighty-seven (87) subjects, forty-seven (47) experimental and forty (40) comparison students.

Social Distance Scale

The Social Distance Scale used in this study (see appendix) was adapted from a scale originally developed by E. S. Borgardus (2) for studying attitudes held by Americans toward a variety of national, ethnic, and racial groups. In the modified scale used in this study, the seven scale respones were weighted from +5 to -2 and summed for each item to produce a score reflecting the respondent's expressed feelings of comfort and social intimacy toward members of that subgroup. The twenty-two (22) subgroups which were identified on the instrument were selected in order to assess respondents' attitudes toward political subgroups, religious subgroups, socio-economic-educational subgroups, racial subgroups, and remote national-ethnic subgroups. The responses to the items concerned with remote subgroups. serve as a baseline for studying other responses since the subgroups mentioned in these items were ones with whom the respondents had had little opportunity for personal contact. Complete pre and post test scores were obtained from eighty-five (85) subjects, forty-six (46) experimental and thirty-nine (39) comparison students.

Testing Procedures

All participants in the study who were present on the day of the pretest administration were instructed to go to the school teaching auditorium for their fifth class period. Test materials were distributed by the research staff of the Alachua County Schools. The research coordinator read aloud the directions for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Social Distance Scale and paced the administration of the instruments by readint the items aloud. Other members of the research staff circulated in the auditorium to answer procedural questions and to monitor student compliance with the directions. One make-up session was held within a few days of the original administration.

The procedures used for posttesting were identical to those outlined for the pretesting.

Students were told that individual results would be held confidential, and numerical coding of answer sheets was used to provide assurance of this intention.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

Attitudes Toward Self

1. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate a greater positive shift from the beginning to the end of the semester on a self-report measure of self-concept than will control students.

   The following comparisons will be involved in testing this hypothesis: total experimental group with total control group; white experimental students with white control students; black experimental with black control students, male experimental students with male control students, and female experimental students with female control students.

2. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate over time, increased personal involvement in activities of the experimental class and enhanced feelings of self-worth as reflected in entries in an open class log book.

3. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate over time, increased awareness of personal values as reflected in their responses to selected instructional strategies of value clarification.

Attitudes Toward Others

1. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate a greater positive shift from the beginning to the end of the semester on a self-report measure of attitudes toward others than will the control students. The attitude measure will include indices of attitudes toward those of different ethnic and religious backgrounds, of different cultural backgrounds, of varying scholastic achievement, and of different life styles.

   The following comparisons will be involved in testing this hypothesis: Total experimental group with total control group; white experimental students with white control students; black experimental students with black control students; male experimental students with male control students, and female experimental students with female control students.

2. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate over time, increasingly positive attitudes toward those who are different from themselves as reflected in entries in an open class log book.

3. Students who participate in the project will demonstrate during the semester of the experimental class, improvement in their ability to tolerate students who are different from themselves as reflected in a lower rate of referrals to deans' and counselors' offices for disruptions than that exhibited by control students.

Statistical Procedures

Test results were analyzed using selected computer programs from the UCLA Biomedical series which is available at the North Florida Regional Data Processing Center at the University of Florida in Gainesville. Pre, post, and difference mean scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale indicators for the experimental and comparison groups and for selected subgroups within these groups were determined. Also, t-values and significance levels for the comparisons of pre-to-post changes for these subjects were calculated by subtracting the comparison group difference from the experimental group difference on each of fifteen indicators. Mean, pre, post, and difference scores on the subscales of the Social Distance Scale for the experimental and comparison groups and for selected subgroups within these groups were determined. Subsequently, t-values and significance levels for the comparisons of pre-to-post changes for these subjects were calculated by subtracting the comparison group difference from the experimental group difference on each of the five subscales.

Discussion of the Results

Attitudes Toward Self

Hypothesis 1

Table 1 provides the findings for the comparisons between the total experimental and comparison groups on the fifteen indicators of self concept selected for examination from those identified by the Tennessee Self Concept Test. Only two of the t-tests between pre-to-post differences were great enough to reach statistical significance. The experimental group demonstrated a reduction in "net conflict" or degree of inconsistency in responses in a given area of self-perception whereas the comparison group demonstrated an increase on this indicator. A complementary finding was the experimental group's growth in "personality integration" whereas the comparison group regressed on this indicator. Both of these shifts which favored the experimental group attained a .05 level of significance.

TABLE 1
TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE
MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (N=47)			COMPARISON GROUP (N=4			
Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Differ-ence	t-tes betwe differ
Self criticism	37.70	36.43	-1.28	37.45	37.18	-0.28	-
Net conflict	0.72	-0.43	-1.15	-0.40	4.63	5.03	-2
otal conflict	34.04	33 40	-0.64	35.30	37.93	2.62	-
Positive identity	118.23	119.36	1.13	117 43	119.95	2.53	-1
Positive self status	101.89	105.98	4.09	102.25	101.78	-0.48	
Positive behavior	103.53	105.94	2.40	103 78	103.10	-0.68	
Positive moral ethical self	64.36	65.09	0.72	65.23	66.10	0.88	-
Positive personal self	64.15	66.62	2.47	62.55	63.93	1.38	-
Positive family self	63.94	64.85	0.92	62.98	64.35	1.38	-1
Positive social self	64.04	66.04	2.00	60.93	63.25	2.33	-
Total variability	45.66	47.11	1.45	49.05	51.98	2.93	-
Defensive positive	51.98	54.92	2.94	58.78	52.15	-6.63	1
General maladjustment	90.19	91.60	1.40	91.35	89.90	-1.45	
Personality integration	8.60	9.79	1.19	10.15	8.55	-1.60	2
Positive Phyiscal self	67.17	68.68	1.51	68.73	67.20	-1.53	

TABLE 1

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

ANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	ENTAL GROUP (N=47)			COMPARISON GROUP (N=40				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	37.70	36.43	-1.28	37.45	37.18	-0.28	-.25	N.S.
	0.72	-0.43	-1.15	-0.40	4.63	5.03	-2.23	.05
	34.04	33.40	-0.64	35.30	37.93	2.62	- .24	N.S.
	118.23	119.36	1.13	117.43	119.95	2.53	-1.09	N.S.
	101.89	105.98	4.09	102.25	101.78	-0.48	.45	N.S.
	103.53	105.94	2.40	103.78	103.10	-0.68	.45	N S.
lf	64.36	65.09	0.72	65.23	66.15	0.88	-.29	N.S.
	64.15	66.62	2.47	62.55	63.93	1.38	-.45	N S.
	63.94	64.85	0.92	62.98	64.35	1.38	-1.12	N.S.
	64.04	66.04	2.00	60.93	63.25	2.33	- .84	N.S.
	45.66	47.11	1.45	49.05	51.98	2.93	- .90	N.S.
	51.98	54.92	2.94	58.78	52.15	-6.63	1.17	N.S.
	90.19	91.60	1.40	91.35	89.90	-1.45	.84	N.S.
	8.60	9.79	1.19	10.15	8.55	-1.60	2.16	.05
	67.17	68.68	1.51	68.73	67.20	-1.53	1.39	N.S.

The findings for comparisons between the experimental white students and the comparison white students are provided in Table 2. Two of the comparisons of mean pre-to-post shift scores were statistically significant and compatible with the results of the total group comparisons. White experimental students demonstrated a slight reduction in their scores on "total variability" or changes in self-perceptions across several areas assessed, whereas white comparison students showed a marked increase in the variability of responses. The difference was significant at the .05 level. The comparison of shift scores on "personality integration" also favored the white experimental students who demonstrated an increase while comparison students demonstrated a decrease. The latter difference attained a '01 significance level.

TABLE 2

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (WHITE, N=30)			COMPARISON GROUP			
Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-te bet diff
Self criticism	38.10	36.87	-1.23	39.38	37.46	-1.92	
Net conflict	-5.93	-4.20	1.73	-6.79	-4.96	1.83	
Total conflict	31.20	29.33	-1.87	29.71	37.04	7.33	-
Positive identity	117.90	120.40	2.50	114.42	118.29	3.88	-
Positive self status	102.07	108.53	6.47	100.46	98.75	-1.71	
Positive behavior	103.90	106.47	2.57	100.67	101.00	0.33	-
Positive moral-ethical self	64.70	66.67	1.97	64.17	65.96	1.79	-
Positive personal self	64.47	67.83	3.37	60.46	62.63	2.17	-
Positive family self	63.53	65.50	1.97	60.79	62.83	2.04	-
Positive social self	64.47	66.60	2.13	59.54	62.17	2.63	-
Total variability	44.40	43.50	-0.90	45.21	52.67	7.46	-
Defensive positive	49.50	54.10	4.60	59.54	48.88	-10.67	
General maladjustment	90.70	93.07	2.37	91.00	88.63	-2.38	
Personality integration	9.53	11.03	1.50	12.38	9.00	-3.38	
Positive physical self	66.70	68.80	2.10	65.50	64.46	-1.04	

TABLE 2

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (WHITE N=30)			COMPARISON GROUP (WHITE N=24)				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	38.10	36.87	-1.23	39.38	37.46	-1.92	.78	N.S
	-5.93	-4.20	1.73	-6.79	-4.96	1.83	-1.33	N.S.
	31.20	29.33	-1.87	29.71	37.04	7.33	-1.64	N.S.
	117.90	120.40	2.50	114.42	118.29	3.88	-.97	N.S.
	102.07	108.53	6.47	100.46	98.75	-1.71	.91	N.S.
	103.90	106.47	2.57	100.67	101.00	0.33	-.13	N.S.
l self	64.70	66.67	1.97	64.17	65.96	1.79	-.20	N.S.
	64.47	67.83	3.37	60.46	62.63	2.17	-.67	N.S.
	63.53	65.50	1.97	60.79	62.83	2.04	-1.24	N.S.
	64.47	66.60	2.13	59.54	62.17	2.63	-.83	N.S.
	44.40	43.50	-0.90	45.21	52.67	7.46	-2.40	.05
	49.50	54.10	4.60	59.54	48.88	-10.67	1.49	N.S.
t	90.70	93.07	2.37	91.00	88.63	-2.38	1.60	N.S.
n	9.53	11.03	1.50	12.38	9.00	-3.38	2.70	.01
	66.70	68.80	2.10	65.50	64.46	-1.04	97	N.S.

The comparisons among mean scores on self-concept indicators for black students are given in Table 3. Only one t-test for the difference between the extent of pre-to-post shift in scores for experimental black students and comparison black students was great enough to be statistically significant. Black experimental students demonstrated a marked decrease in "net conflict" whereas their comparison counterparts demonstrated a marked increase on this indicator. The difference was significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 3

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

Variable Label	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (BLACK) (N=17) Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	COMPARISON GROUP (BLA N=) Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-t bet dif
Self criticism	37.00	35.65	-1.35	34.56	36.75	2.19	
Net conflict	12.47	6.24	-6.24	9.19	19.00	9.81	
Total conflict	39.06	40.59	1.53	43.69	39.25	-4.44	
Positive identity	118.82	117.53	-1.29	121.94	122.44	0.50	-
Positive self status	101.59	101.47	-0.12	104.94	106.31	1.38	
Positive behavior	102.88	105.00	2.12	108.44	106.25	-2.19	
Positive moral-ethical self	63.76	62.29	-1.47	66.81	66.31	-0.50	-
Positive personal self	63.59	64.47	0.88	65.69	65.88	0.19	
Positive family self	67.65	63.71	-0.94	66.25	66.63	0.38	
Positive social self	63.29	65.06	1.77	63.00	64.88	1.88	-
Total variability	47.88	53.47	5.59	54.81	50.94	-3.88	
Defensive positive	56.35	56.35	0.00	57.63	57.06	-0.56	
General maladjustment	89.29	89.00	-0.29	91.88	91.81	-0.06	-
Personality integration	6.94	7.59	0.65	6.81	7.88	1.06	
Positive physical self	68.00	68.47	0.47	73.56	71.31	-2.25	

TABLE 3

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

IMENTAL GROUP (BLACK N=17)				COMPARISON GROUP (BLACK N=16)				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	37.00	35.65	-1.35	34.56	36.75	2.19	-1.21	N S
	12.47	6.24	-6.24	9.19	19.00	9.81	-1.54	.01
	39.06	40.59	1.53	43.69	39.25	-4.44	1.41	N.S.
	118.82	117.53	-1.29	121.94	122.44	0.50	-.56	N.S.
	101.59	101.47	-0.12	104.94	106.31	1.38	-.33	N.S.
	102.88	105.00	2.12	108.44	106.25	-2.19	.80	N.S.
self	63.76	62.29	-1.47	66.81	66.31	-0.50	-.22	N.S.
	63.59	64.47	0.88	65.69	65.88	0.19	.06	N.S.
	64.65	63.71	-0.94	66.25	66.63	0.38	-.31	N.S.
	63.29	65.06	1.77	63.00	64.88	1.88	-.34	N.S.
	47.88	53.47	5.59	54.81	50.94	-3.88	1.26	N.S.
	56.35	56.35	0.00	57.63	57.06	-0.56	.11	N.S.
	89.29	89.00	-0.29	91.88	91.81	-0.06	-.48	N.S.
	6.94	7.59	0.65	6.81	7.88	1.06	.26	N.S.
	65.00	68.47	0.47	73.56	71.31	-2.25	1.01	N.S.

Table 4 provides mean scores for male students in the experimental and comparison groups. Two of the comparisons of pre-to-post shifts in average scores were significant at the .01 level. Experimental male students demonstrated a greater reduction in "net conflict" than did the comparison male students. Also, the experimental male students increased their scores on "positive self status" or positive self assessment while the comparison white students demonstrated a decrease on this indicator of self-concept.

TABLE 4

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (MALE (N=27)			COMPARISON GROUP			
Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differ
Self criticism	38.30	36.59	-1.70	38.55	37.00	-1.55	—
Net conflict	3.30	1.04	-2.26	-5.27	-3.86	1.41	-1.
Total conflict	34.41	34.52	0.11	31.09	34.59	3.50	-
Positive identity	116.70	117.22	0.52	118.36	117.96	-0.41	
Positive self status	101.11	105.78	4.67	105.55	100.59	-4.96	1
Positive behavior	100.96	105.67	4.70	103.82	102.86	-0.96	1
Positive moral ethical self	62.10	64.56	2.56	65.86	64.55	-1.32	1
Positive personal self	64.48	66.67	2.19	65.14	63.77	-1.36	
Positive family self	62.78	63.89	1.11	64.36	63.36	-1.00	
Positive social self	62.19	64.59	2.41	64.00	62.82	-1.18	
Total variability	44.96	46.48	1.52	48.32	51.23	2.91	
Defensive positive	51.89	55.26	3.37	50.55	50.41	-0.14	
General maladjustment	89.37	89.85	0.48	91.77	89.77	-2.00	
Personality integration	9.41	9.44	0.04	9.77	9.46	-0.32	
Positive physical self	67.33	68.96	1.63	68.36	66.91	-1.46	1

TABLE 4

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	MENTAL GROUP (MALE N=27)			COMPARISON GROUP (MALE N=20)				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	38.30	36.59	-1.70	38.55	37.00	-1.55	-.10	N.S.
	3.30	1.04	-2.26	-5.27	-3.86	1.41	-1.82	.10
	34.41	34.52	0.11	31.09	34.59	3.50	-.21	N.S.
	116.70	117.22	0.52	118.36	117.96	-0.41	.10	N.S.
	101.11	105.78	4.67	105.55	100.59	-4.96	1.81	.10
	100.96	105.67	4.70	103.82	102.86	-0.96	1.45	N.S.
self	62.10	64.56	2.56	65.86	64.55	-1.32	1.76	N.S.
	64.48	66.67	2.19	65.14	63.77	-1.36	.53	N.S.
	62.78	63.89	1.11	64.36	63.36	-1.00	.26	N.S.
	62.19	64.59	2.41	64.00	62.82	-1.18	.87	N.S.
	44.96	46.48	1.52	48.32	51.23	2.91	-.32	N.S.
	51.89	55.26	3.37	50.55	50.41	-0.14	-.12	N.S.
	89.37	89.85	0.48	91.77	89.77	-2.00	.46	N.S.
	9.41	9.44	0.04	9.77	9.46	-0.32	.41	N.S.
	67.33	68.96	1.63	68.36	66.91	-1.46	1.45	N.S.

Mean scores for female students in the two groups are given in Table 5. Five of the comparisons between shift scores yielded statistically significant results, three of which favored the comparison group over the experimental group. The comparison female students showed a gain on the "positive moral-ethical self" indicator, whereas the experimental female students showed a decrease on this measure. The difference was significant at the .05 level. On the indicators called "positive family self" and "positive social self" the comparison female students demonstrated a greater positive gain from pre-to-post test than did the experimental female students. These differences were significant at the .10 and .05 levels respectively. However, the experimental female students demonstrated an increase on indicators of "defensive positive" (constructive self defenses) and "personality integration", whereas the comparison female students regressed on these two indicators. These differences attained the .10 and .05 levels of significance respectively.

None of the comparisons on the fifteen indicators of self concept for academic oriented experimental and comparison students reached statistical significance. The pre, post, and difference means for these subgroups are given in Table 6. However, comparisons for vocationally oriented students, provided in Table 7, produced four differences which were statistically significant. Experimental vocational students demonstrated a decrease in "net conflict" whereas comparison vocational students demonstrated an increase.

This difference between pre-post shift scores which formed the experimental group was significant at the .10 level. Although comparison vocational students demonstrated a large decline on the "defensive positive" score, experimental vocational students remained relatively stable on this indicator. This difference, significant at the .10 level, was one in which the comparison students exhibited a greater shift toward the normal range than did experimental students. However, the vocational comparison students' pretest mean score indicated an unusually high defensive distortion in responses. On the "general maladjustment" indicator, experimental vocational students showed a small increase whereas comparison vocational students demonstrated a decrease. This difference, which again favors the comparison group with respect to a greater positive score shift, was significant at the .10 level. With respect to "personality integration" the experimental vocational students demonstrated a slight increase in score from pre to post test whereas the comparison vocational students demonstrated a large score decrease. This difference attained on a .05 level of significance in favor of the experimental group.

Although these findings are tentative, they suggest that the experimental treatment activities in which the students participated tended to reduce inconsistency in reported self perceptions in areas defined by the Tennessee Self Concept Test and tended to increase reported personality integration. The findings also suggest that program participation produced different kinds of self-reported effects for different subgroups within the experimental group. Obtained race and sex differences and academic/vocational orientation differences shed light on the degree to which these subgroup scores contributed to the major findings, and these scores also raise the need for further investigation of selective program impact.

Although the findings on the self-report self-concept scale were not as dramatic as expected, the relatively consistent results concerning reduction in "net conflict" and increase in "personality integration" are viewed as support for the major set of hypotheses regarding attitudes toward self.

TABLE 6
TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE
MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (N=31)			COMPARISON GROUP (N=2			
Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differe
Self criticism	37.58	36.06	-1.52	37.66	38.10	0.45	-1
Net conflict	-3.58	-1.68	1.90	-3.45	1.06	4.52	-1
Total conflict	33.97	30.99	-2.10	35.79	38.10	2.31	
Positive identity	117.42	120.74	1.32	116.41	118.72	2.31	-1
Positive self status	102.13	107.48	5.36	102.76	99.79	-2.97	
Positive behavior	104.74	107.77	3.03	103.79	102.06	-1.74	
Positive moral ethical self	65.37	66.58	1.19	66.24	66.03	-0.21	-
Positive personal self	64.94	67.90	2.97	63.17	62.69	0.48	
Positive family self	64.13	65.71	1.58	64.52	63.52	-1.00	
Positive social self	64.68	66.61	1.94	62.03	62.28	0.24	-
Total variability	44.13	44.55	0.42	49.21	52.41	3.21	-
Defensive positive	50.55	55.19	4.65	50.38	49.24	-1.14	
General maladjustment	91.65	92.87	1.23	87.17	88.90	-0.28	-
Personality integration	9.42	11.13	1.71	8.79	9.07	0.28	
Positive physical self	64.16	66.19	2.03	67.00	66.00	-1.00	

TABLE 6

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (N=31)			COMPARISON GROUP (N=24)				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	39.58	36.06	-1.52	37.66	38.10	0.45	-1.37	N.S.
	-3.58	-1.68	1.90	-3.45	1.06	4.52	-1.32	N.S.
	33.97	30.94	-2.10	35.79	38.10	2.31	.00	N.S.
	119.42	120.74	1.32	116.41	118.72	2.31	-1.24	N.S
	101.13	107.48	5.36	102.76	99.79	-2.97	.68	N.S.
	104.74	107.77	3.03	103.79	102.06	-1.74	.89	N.S
elf	65.39	66.58	1.19	66.24	66.03	-0.21	-.01	N.S
	64.94	67.90	2.97	63.17	62.69	0.48	.21	N.S
	64.13	65.71	1.58	67.52	63.52	-1.00	.05	N.S
	64.68	66.61	1.94	62.03	62.28	0.24	-.36	N.S
	44.13	44.55	0.42	49.21	52.41	3.21	-.58	N.S.
	50.55	55.19	4.65	50.38	49.24	-1.14	.34	N.S
	91.65	92.87	1.23	89.17	88.90	-0.28	-.58	N.S
	9.42	11.13	1.71	8.79	9.07	0.28	.78	N.S.
	64.10	67.19	2.95	67.00	66.00	-1.00	.92	N.S.

TABLE 7

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP VOCATIONAL (N=16)			COMPARISON GROUP VOCATIONAL			
Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differe
Self criticism	37.94	37.13	-0.81	36.91	34.73	-2.18	
Net conflict	9.06	2.00	-7.06	7.64	14.00	6.36	-1.
Total conflict	35.94	38.13	2.19	34.00	37.46	3.46	-.
Positive identity	115.94	116.69	0.75	120.09	123.18	3.09	-.
Positive self status	101.44	103.06	1.63	100.91	107.00	6.09	
Positive behavior	101.19	102.38	1.19	103.73	106.00	2.27	-.
Positive moral ethical self	62.38	62.19	-0.19	62.55	66.27	3.73	-.3
Positive personal self	62.63	64.13	1.50	60.91	67.18	6.27	-.2
Positive family self	63.56	63.19	-0.38	58.91	66.55	7.64	-1.5
Positive social self	62.81	64.94	2.13	58.00	65.82	7.82	-.7
Total variability	48.63	52.06	3.44	48.64	50.82	2.18	-.6
Defensive positive	54.75	54.38	-0.38	80.91	59.82	-21.09	1.3
General maladjustment	87.38	89.13	1.75	97.09	92.55	4.55	1.2
Personality integration	7.00	7.19	0.19	13.73	7.18	-6.55	2.
Positive physical self	62.19	62.69	0.50	73.27	70.36	-2.91	1

TABLE 7

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

EANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

ENTAL GROUP (VOCATIONAL N=16)				COMPARISON GROUP (VOCATIONAL N=11)				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	37.44	37.13	- 0.81	36.91	34.73	-2.18	.77	N.S.
	9.06	2.00	- 7.06	7.64	14.00	6.36	-1.80	.10
	35.94	38.13	2.19	34.00	37.46	3.46	- .31	N.S.
	115.94	116.69	0.75	120.09	123.18	3.09	- .40	N.S.
	101.44	103.06	1.63	100.91	107.00	6.09	.02	N.S
	101.19	102.38	1.19	103.73	106.00	2.27	- .15	N.S.
elf	62.38	62.19	-0.19	62.55	66.27	3.73	- .37	N.S.
	62.63	64.13	1.50	60.91	67.18	6.27	- .75	N.S.
	63.56	63.19	-0.38	58.91	66.55	7.64	-1.51	N.S.
	62.81	64.94	2.13	58.00	65.82	7.82	- .77	N.S.
	48.63	52.06	3.44	48.64	50.82	2.18	- .64	N.S
	54.75	54.38	-0.38	80.91	59.82	-21.09	1.79	.10
	87.38	89.13	1.75	97.09	92.55	4.55	1.74	.10
	7.00	7.19	0.19	13.73	7.18	-6.55	2.15	.05
	62.19	62.69	0.50	73.27	70.36	-2.91	1.05	N.S.

Hypothesis 2

Evidence regarding this hypothesis was insufficient to permit analysis. Although students regularly discussed their feelings of involvement in class activities, the majority of participants did not record these responses in the log books. For a number of students, difficulties in written self expression posed a barrier to effective use of the log books.

Hypothesis 3

Approximately 85 percent of the students participating in the experimental class successfully completed a post-test on procedures for value clarification and for analysis of value statements. Successful completion required the creation and critique of personal value statements. These data are taken to constitute evidence in support of the hypothesis.

Attitudes Toward Others

Hypothesis 1

A modified form of the Social Distance Scale was used to assess changes in attitudes toward others within the experimental and comparison groups during the period of the project. The only difference found between groups or subgroups involved changes in attitudes toward religious subgroups. Table 8 indicates that both the experimental and the comparison demonstrated a decrease from pre to post test in their degree of positive orientation toward religious subgroups. However, for the experimental group this change in a negative direction was much smaller than for the comparison group, and consequently the t test generated a difference which was significant at the .05 level.

Although, in general, the trend found in the analysis of differences holds for the comparisons between subgroups of the experimental and comparison subgroups, Table 11 demonstrates that much of the main finding is attributable to the change in attitudes toward religious subgroups reported by male participants in the study. The difference between the degree of change in a negative direction for experimental male students and comparison male students reached the .05 level of significance.

None of the other comparisons made using the Social Distance Scale attained statistical significance. Hence the pilot study obtained no evidence to support the first hypothesis regarding changes in attitudes toward others. However, it is interesting to note that, with very few exceptions, the mean positive attitude scores for students in the experimental group were higher on both the pre and post tests, for all clustered subgroups than were the scores for students in the comparison group. In a number of instances the mean scores were very close to total positive mean score which it was possible to attain. Hence, it appears that the experimental students held attitudes which were systematically different from those held by comparison students and that the instrument selected to assess attitude change was for the purpose of this study, structurally limited and consequently insenditive to changes in attitudes toward others.

Hypothesis 2

As reported in the results section concerning attitudes toward self, the data collected using the open class log book were insufficient for analysis. However, the teachers and group leaders for the experimental group were able to document series of events which occurred in their groups indicating increased openness in attitudes toward others. These events were examined during planning sessions to provide formative evaluation in designing learning experiences for the pilot study participants.

TABLE 8

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (N=112)			COMPARISON GROUP			
Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between difference
Attitudes toward Political subgroups	10.[illegible]	11.04	0.31*	[illegible]	11.34	.[illegible]	[illegible]
Attitudes toward Religious subgroups	13.41	13.51	-0.46	11.99	10.[illegible]	1.22	
Attitudes toward Socio-economic subgroups	12.[illegible]	12.89	0.07*	11.63	12.[illegible]	1.19	-.[illegible]
Attitudes toward Racial subgroups	7.25	7.29	0.72	6.71	6.[illegible]2	.12	.[illegible]
Attitudes toward Remote subgroups	11.[illegible]	12.[illegible]	0.33	9.45	9.43	0.75	1.[illegible]

The five clusters analyzed contained responses to the following subgroups:
Political - Democrats, Republicans, Radicals, Conservatives, Yippies
Religious - Jews, Catholics, Baptists
Socio-economic-educational - rich people, poor people, University people
Hippies, "brains", slow-learners
Racial - rednecks, blacks, whites, black militants, KKK
Remote - Cubans, Chicanos, American Indians

TABLE 8

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

ENTAL GROUP (N = 45)				COMPARISON GROUP N				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	10.[illegible]	11.04	[illegible]	[illegible]	11.34	.24	-.25	N.S.
	13.11	13.[illegible]	[illegible]	11.94	[illegible]	1.22	.1	.05
	[illegible]	12.31	0.67	11.63	[illegible]	1.44	-.50	N.S.
	7.25	[illegible]	0.72	6.71	6.[illegible]2	.72	.24	N.S.
	[illegible]	12.[illegible]	0.33	9.49	9.73	0.73	1.12	N.S.

The five clusters analyzed contained responses to the following subgroups:
Political - Democrats, Republicans, Radicals, Conservatives, Yippies
Religious - Jews, Catholics, Baptists
Socio-economic-educational - rich people, poor people, University people
Hippies, "brains", slow-learners
Racial - rednecks, blacks, whites, black militants, KKK
Remote - Cubans, Chicanos, American Indians

TABLE 1

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (WHITE (N=29)			COMPARISON GROUP (W			
Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-tes betw diffe
Attitudes toward Political subgroups	12.58	12.9-	0.76	11.86	11.04	-0.773	1.
Attitudes toward Religious subgroups	14.03	14.34	.32	14.03	13.49	-0.54	1.
Attitudes toward Socio-economic subgroups	13.71	13.61	0.10	12.85	12.94	0.08	.
Attitudes toward Racial subgroups	7.04	7.83	0.79	6.23	7.03	0.80	.
Attitudes toward Remote subgroups	12.18	13.42	0.74	11.46	11.82	0.53	.

TABLE 1

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

MENTAL GROUP (WHITE (N=29)				COMPARISON GROUP (WHITE (N=22				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	12.58	13.34	0.76	11.86	11.04	-0.773	1.71	N.S.
	14.52	14.54	.02	14.03	13.49	-0.54	1.51	N.S.
	13.71	13.61	0.10	12.85	12.94	0.08	.25	N.S.
	7.04	7.83	0.79	6.23	7.03	0.80	.32	N.S.
	12.68	13.42	0.74	11.46	11.82	0.53	.71	N.S.

TABLE 10

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BLACK (N=16) COMPARISON GROUP Bl (N

Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-te bet diff
Attitudes toward Political subgroups	8.14	9.33	1.19	6.59	9.80	3.21	
Attitudes toward Religious subgroups	11.50	10.15	-1.35	9.06	6.86	-2.20	
Attitudes toward Socio-economic subgroups	11.15	11.53	0.37	9.87	12.65	2.79	-1
Attitudes toward Racial subgroups	7.65	8.23	0.58	7.39	6.52	-0.87	
Attitudes toward Remote subgroups	8.18	9.18	1.00	6.56	7.21	0.65	

TABLE 10

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

RIMENTAL GROUP (BLACK N=16)				COMPARISON GROUP (BLACK N=16)				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	8.14	9.33	1.19	6.59	9.80	3.21	1.82	N.S.
	11.50	10.15	-1.35	9.06	6.86	-2.20	1.45	N.S.
	11.15	11.53	0.37	9.87	12.65	2.79	-1.32	N.S.
	7.65	8.23	0.58	7.39	6.52	-0.87	.73	N.S.
	8.78	9.78	1.00	6.56	7.21	0.65	.85	N.S.

TABLE 11

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (N=26)			COMPARISON GROUP			
Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences
Attitudes toward Political subgroups	11.77	12.39	0.62	11.09	10.99	-0.10	.
Attitudes toward Religious subgroups	13.81	13.41	-0.40	13.35	11.75	-1.60	2.
Attitudes toward Socio-economic subgroups	13.24	13.35	0.11	12.96	13.42	0.46	.
Attitudes toward Racial subgroups	5.25	4.24	1.02	6.13	7.26	1.13	.
Attitudes toward Remote subgroups	12.30	12.24	-0.06	11.36	11.87	0.52	.3

TABLE 11

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

IMENTAL GROUP (N=26)				COMPARISON GROUP (N=22)				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	11.77	11.31	0.62	11.09	10.99	0.10	.81	N.S.
	15.81	15.41	-0.40	13.35	11.75	-1.60	2.46	.05
	13.46	13.35	0.11	12.96	13.42	0.76	.07	N.S.
	3.25	4.27	1.02	6.13	7.26	1.13	.18	N.S.
	12.53	11.87	-0.66	11.36	11.31	0.52	.31	N.S.

TABLE 12

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (FEMALE) (N=19)				COMPARISON GROUP (FEM (N=			
Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-te betw diff
Attitudes toward Political subgroups	9.96	10.79	0.83	8.07	10.06	1.99	-1
Attitudes toward Religious subgroups	13.03	12.49	-0.54	10.41	9.64	-0.77	
Attitudes toward Socio-economic subgroups	12.28	12.29	0.00	10.08	12.13	2.05	-
Attitudes toward Racial subgroups	5.10	6.18	0.32	7.37	6.31	-1.07	
Attitudes toward Remote subgroups	9.41	11.40	1.99	7.2[illegible]	8.25	1.[illegible]	1.

TABLE 12

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

MENTAL GROUP (FEMALE (N=19)			COMPARISON GROUP (FEMALE (N=18)				
Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
9.96	10.79	0.83	8.07	10.06	1.99	-1.13	N.S.
13.03	12.49	-0.54	10.41	9.64	-0.77	.52	N.S.
12.28	12.29	0.00	10.08	12.13	2.05	-.92	N.S
5.10	6.13	0.32	7.37	6.31	-1.07	.14	N.S.
9.41	11.40	1.99	7.2[illegible]	8.25	1.[illegible]	1.2[illegible]	N.S.

TABLE 13

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

ACADEMIC

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (N=30)

ACA

COMPARISON GROUP (

Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-te bet diff
Attitudes toward Political subgroups	12.42	12.28	-0.14	10.94	11.14	0.20	-
Attitudes toward Religious subgroups	14.25	14.26	0.01	13.22	11.93	-1.36	1.
Attitudes toward Socio-economic subgroups	13.74	13.68	-0.07	12.39	13.03	0.64	-.
Attitudes toward Racial subgroups	7.34	8.04	0.70	7.23	6.91	-0.32	1.
Attitudes toward Remote subgroups	12.62	13.08	0.46	10.04	11.19	1.54	-.

TABLE 13

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

MENTAL GROUP (ACADEMIC N=30)				COMPARISON GROUP (ACADEMIC N=29)				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	12.42	12.28	-0.14	10.94	11.14	0.20	-1.20	N.S.
	14.25	14.26	0.01	13.22	11.93	-1.31	1.62	N.S.
	13.74	13.68	-0.07	12.39	13.03	0.61	-.05	N.S.
	7.34	8.04	0.70	7.23	6.91	-0.32	1.25	N.S.
	12.62	13.08	0.46	10.04	11.19	1.54	-.10	N.S.

TABLE 14

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP VICATIONAL (N=15)			COMPARISON GROUP VOC (N			
Variable Label	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-t be dif
Attitudes toward Political subgroups	8.00	10.48	2.48	6.92	9.26	2.35	
Attitudes toward Religious subgroups	11.87	10.45	-1.42	9.22	8.18	-1.04	
Attitudes toward Socio-economic subgroups	10.92	11.25	0.33	9.91	12.36	2.44	-
Attitudes toward Racial subgroups	7.08	7.83	0.75	5.53	6.63	1.10	-
Attitudes toward Remote subgroups	8.66	10.26	1.60	8.11	7.10	-1.01	1.

TABLE 14

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

MENTAL GROUP VOCATIONAL (N=15)				COMPARISON GROUP VOCATIONAL (N=11)				
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference	t-test between differences	Significance Level
	8.00	10.48	2.48	6.92	9.26	2.35	.65	N.S.
	11.87	10.45	-1.42	9.22	8.18	-1.04	1.38	N.S.
	10.92	11.25	0.33	9.91	12.36	2.47	-.60	N.S
	7.08	7.83	0.75	5.53	6.63	1.10	-.67	N.S
	8.66	10.26	1.60	8.11	7.10	-1.01	1.56	N.S

The S - D Scale

Code no._____

Seven kinds of social contacts are given for each of the groups listed below. You are asked to give your first feeling reactions to every group in the following list which you have ever heard of. Do not think about individuals in each of these groups, but think about the group as a whole. Put a check mark in each column that tells how you might act toward members of that group.

Remember:

1. **Give your first feeling reactions for every group.**
2. **Give your feeling toward each group as a whole.**
3. **Check as many columns for each group as you wish, and work rapidly.**

	I would date members of this group	I would have members of this group as close friends	I would have members of this group as my next-door neighbors	I would work with members of this group on a job	I would talk with members of this group if necessary	I w ign mem of gro
1. Democrats	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Jews	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Rich people	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Hippies	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Radicals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Catholics	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. "Rednecks"	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Blacks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. Republicans	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. Cubanos	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

The S - D Scale

acts are given for each of the groups listed below. You are asked to give your first
group in the following list which you have ever heard of. Do not think about particular
ge groups, but think about the group as a whole. Put a check mark in each column which
ward members of that group.

reactions for every group.
rd each group as a whole.
for each group as you wish, and work rapidly.

would te members this group	I would have members of this group as close friends	I would have members of this group as my next-door neighbors	I would work with members of this group on a job	I would talk with members of this group if necessary	I would ignore members of this group	I would avoid members of this group

The S - D Scale (con't)

	I would date members of this group	I would have members of this group as close friends	I would have members of this group as my next-door neighbors	I would work with members of this group on a job	I would talk with members of this group if necessary	I ig me of gr
1. Conservatives						
12. "Brains"						
13. American Indians						
14. Yippies						
15. Baptists						
16. Whites						
17. Poor people						
18. Black militants						
19. Klud Klux Klanners						
20. University people						
21. Slow learners						
22. Chicanos						

I would date members of this group	I would have members of this group as close friends	I would have members of this group as my next-door neighbors	I would work with members of this group on a job	I would talk with members of this group if necessary	I would ignore members of this group	I would avoid members of this group

The S - D Scale

Code no._____

Seven kinds of social contacts are given for each of the groups listed below. You are asked to giv feeling reactions to every group in the following list which you have ever heard of. Do not think a individuals in each of these groups, but think about the group as a whole. Put a check mark in each tells how you might act toward members of that group.

Remember:

1. Give your first feeling reactions for every group.
2. Give your feeling toward each group as a whole.
3. Check as many columns for each group as you wish, and work rapidly.

	I would date members of this group	I would have members of this group as close friends	I would have members of this group as my next-door neighbors	I would work with members of this group on a job	I would talk with members of this group if necessary	I
1. Democrats						
2. Jews						
3. Rich people						
4. Hippies						
5. Radicals						
6. Catholics						
7. "Rednecks"						
8. Blacks						
9. Republicans						
10. Cubanos						

The S - D Scale

ntacts are given for each of the groups listed below. You are asked to give your first
ry group in the following list which you have ever heard of. Do not think about particular
hese groups, but think about the group as a whole. Put a check mark in each column which
toward members of that group.

ing reactions for every group.
ward each group as a whole.
s for each group as you wish, and work rapidly.

I would date members of this group	I would have members of this group as close friends	I would have members of this group as my next-door neighbors	I would work with members of this group on a job	I would talk with members of this group if necessary	I would ignore members of this group	I would avoid members of this group

The S - D Scale (con't)

	I would date members of this group	I would have members of this group as close friends	I would have members of this group as my next-door neighbors	I would work with members of this group on a job	I would talk with members of this group if necessary	I
11. Conservatives						
12. "Brains"						
13. American Indians						
14. Yippies						
15. Baptists						
16. Whites						
17. Poor people						
18. Black militants						
19. Klud Klux Klanners						
20. University people						
21. Slow learners						
22. Chicanos						

I would date members of this group	I would have members of this group as close friends	I would have members of this group as my next-door neighbors	I would work with members of this group on a job	I would talk with members of this group if necessary	I would ignore members of this group	I would avoid members of this group

Hypothesis 3

Examination of the referral records made by counselors and deans for students identified as members of the experimental or comparison groups indicated an increase in visits to the guidance office and a decrease in visits to the deans' offices for both groups. The rate of referrals to both counselors and deans was very similar for both groups. Since these findings were consistent for both groups, it is probable that factors outside the experiences provided in the pilot study were more determinative than was experimental class participation. For example, since the majority of participants and comparison students were seniors, they were likely to visit the guidance office during their last semester in order to review guidance records and other requirements for graduation. Lower rates of referrals to the deans' offices for both groups of students may reflect the desire of regular classroom teachers to "hassle" students at the end of their school career as little as possible.

Since there was no significant differential in the rates of referrals to counselors and deans for experimental and for comparison students, no evidence was available to support the third hypothesis with respect to changes in attitudes toward others. However, teachers and group leaders for the pilot study clearly stated their conviction that participation in the experimental class provided an invironment where students might vent their frustrations and resentment without fear of reprisal from either teachers or students. They felt that the class was particularly important as a safety valve for black students who had been transferred to the school the previous year when the black high school was closed.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Although the research findings using standardized and semi-standardized instruments provided little evidence to support the hypothesis of the pilot study, informal formative evaluation collected during the course of the study suggested that the experimental program was reasonably effective in meeting its objections in modifying attitudes toward self and toward others. Further study is needed with additional instruments and perhaps with participating students at different phases in their high school career in order to sort out possible program effects from broader age and school expectation effects.

REFERENCES

1. Bower, Eli M. "The Achievement of Mental Competency," Learning and Mental Health in the School, ASCD Yearbook, Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1966, p.23.

2. Crosby, Muriel. An Adventure in Human Relations: A Three Year Experimental Project on School in Changing Neighborhoods, 1959-1962, Wilmington, Delaware: Wilmington Public Elementary Schools, 1960, 1962, 1963.

3. Forth, H. G. Piaget and Knowledge. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1969.

4. Hall, E. T. The Silent Language. New York: Doubleday, 1959, p. 43.

5. Hayakawa, S. I. "Communications: Interracial and International," ETC: A Review of General Semantics, 1963, 20, pp. 395-396.

6. Marckwardt, A. H. "Implications of Language Process for the Teacher," Language, Linquistics, and School Programs. Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1963, pp. 30-32.

7. Mehrabian, A. "Cognitive-Developmental Approaches to Personality." Chapter 5 in An Analysis of Personality Theories. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968, pp. 121-164.

8. National College of Education. Value Sharing. Evanston, Illinois: National College of Education, 1969.

9. Piaget, I., and Barbel Inhelder. The Psychology of the Child. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

10. Rapoport, Anatol. "Attitudes Toward Language and Communication," ETC.: A Review of General Semantics, 1963, 20, p. 394.

11. Smith, B. Othanel. "Teaching and Testing Values," Proceedings of the 1965 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, pp. 50-59. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1966.

12. Taba, Hilda. Leadership Training in Intergroup Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1953.

13. Taba, Hilda and others. Intergroup Education in Public Schools. Washington, D. C. American Council on Education, 1951.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Chris Argyris, "Organization and Innovation" in Mirrors for Behavior, Vol.7, no. 31. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1970.

2. E. S. Bogardus, "Social Distance Scale" in Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes eidted by M. E. Shaw and Jack M. Wright, New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.

APPENDIX

GROUP DECISIONS INSTRUCTIONS

Consensus is a decision process for making full use of available resources and for resolving conflicts creatively. Consensus is difficult to reach, so not every ranking will meet with everyone's complete approval. Complete unanimity is not the goal--it is rarely achieved. But each individual should be able to accept the group rankings on the basis of logic and feasibility. When all group members feel this way, you have reached consensus as defined here, and the single person can block the group if he thinks it necessary; at the same time, he should use this option in the best sense of reciprocity. Here are some guidelines to use in achieving consensus:

1. Avoid arguing for your own rankings. Present your position as lucidly and logically as possible, but listen to the other members' reactions and consider them carefully before you press your point.

2. Do not assume that someone must win and someone must lose when discussion reaches a stalemate. Instead, look for the next-most-acceptable alternative for all parties.

3. Do not change your mind simply to avoid conflict and to reach agreement and harmony. When agreement seems to come too quickly and easily, be suspicious. Explore the reasons and be sure everyone accepts the solution for basically similar or complementary reasons. Yield only to positions that have objective and logically sound foundations.

4. Avoid conflict-reducing techniques such as majority vote, averages, coin-flips and bargaining. When a dissenting member finally agrees, don't feel that he must be rewarded by having his own way on some later point.

5. Differences of opinion are natural and expected. Seek them out and try to involve everyone in the decision process. Disagreements can help the group's decision because with a wide range of information and opinions, there is greater chance that the group will hit upon more adequate solutions.

32 discussion groups of four to six members each.

APPENDIX

CATEGORIES FOR THE ARGYRIS SYSTEM BY CHRIS ARGYRIS

LEVEL I: INDIVIDUAL/INTERPERSONAL

1. Owning Up To
   The first category refers to the behavior of the individual being aware of and accepting responsibility for the behavior that he manifests. The individual is able to identify his behavior, communicate it, and accept ownership of it.

2. Not Owning Up To
   Being unable or unwilling to be aware of, identify, and own up to one's behavior.

3. Openness
   Behavior that enlarges the individual's scope, or pushes back his boundaries of awareness and responsibility. The individual permits and encourages the reception of new information.

4. Not Open
   The behavior that constricts the individual's boundaries of awareness and responsibility. The individual discourages the reception of new information.

5. Experimenting
   That behavior which represents some risk for the individual. The purpose of the risk taking is to generate new information on the i or f level. The individual may be observed manipulating his internal or external environment in order to create new information. The risk is evaluated in terms of the probability that such explorations could upset the individual's self-acceptance.

6. Rejecting Experimenting
   The behavior that prevents the system from taking risks.

The next six categories are the same as those above except that they focus on the behavior that helps or does not help others to do the behaviors described above.

7. Helping Others to Own Up

8. Not Helping Others to Own Up

9. Helping Others to Be Open

10. Not Helping Others to Be Open

11. Helping Others to Experiment

12. Not Helping Others to Experiment

APPENDIX

UNDER THE SWAY OF THE GREAT APES

Edwin P. Young, an uncelebrated philosopher, once observed of football, "After all, it's only a game that kids can play." This is no longer strictly true. If it were, the networks would not have bought it up as a vehicle to sell cigarettes, cars and beer.

The evidence suggests that it satisfies some inner need of the spectator so completely that it can rivet him to his chair through a holiday in disregard of family life or bring him to his feet howling for (Allie) Sherman's head when the outcome fails to gratify.

If sports have ceased to be only games that kids can play and become psychotherapy for the mob, it is too bad, especially for kids who will grow up hating them or busting gussets to achieve therapeutic professional excellence.

What is worse though, is the distortion of values that radiates throughout the society. For thirty minutes of farce, Liston and Clay can earn more than the entire faculty of a public school can make in a decade.

1. Did you watch football on New Years Day?
2. Is it a pattern of yours? Is it something about which you are proud?
3. How would you answer Mr. Baker?
4. Do you think the publisher of Harpers or Atlantic could benefit from taking ads during the televising of a football game? Comment.
5. Does this sheet make you want to do anything different in your life?

APPENDIX

TV, Comics and Violence

On the television screen, about 50 actors and actresses (by latest count) keel over gloriously every week. In comic strips, characters are being punched, stabbed, choked and shot to death with approximately the same consistency. In fact, murder and mayhem have become such an integral part of entertainment in this country, that viewers of all ages tend to think of violence as part of wholesome living, like having picnics on Sunday...

It is time we stopped recommending brutality as a way of having fun. It takes no particular strength or courage to hit somebody in the mouth, kick him him in the stomach, break a piece of furniture over his head. And even a child's forefinger can pull a trigger. *

To think on and to write on:

1. Really, now, what's all the fuss about?

2. You've watched T.V. and read comic books, and you're not violent. Comment.

3. What policy will you take to your own children about T.V. and comics?

4. Do you do anything to affirm that life is valuable?

5. Does a tabloid like the New York Daily News make life seem less valuable? Do you advocate censorship? What can be done?

6. Do your T.V. and reading habits contribute to your immaturity? What IS the impact of your T.V. and reading time? Explain.

APPENDIX

A Student's Report of a Campus Incident

Someone was caught cheating on an exam in an advanced biology class. The teacher tried to take the paper away, but the boy held on to it. When the teacher finally got hold of the test, several index cards fell out from between the pages. The boy screamed that they were not his. To make a long story short, the teacher informed the student that this would have to be reported to the authorities. The boy threatened to kill the teacher, and they scuffled until other teachers came to get the boy away. The boy had been accepted by a medical school, and this incident meant no med-school for him. His actions were explained by a weak personality cracking under the system. But what amazed me was the reactions of other pre-med students. Their near joy was hard to hide. How awfully sadistic. Or was their joy a sign of relief for not having been caught themselves?

1. What is your first, most immediate reaction? (Use free association. Don't write sentences; just put down words.)
2. In what ways do you identify with the boy?
3. In what ways do you identify with the teacher?
4. The author of the incident raises a point about the other students in the class. Comment on that.
5. To cheat or not to cheat? What is the rationalization for each position?
6. What alternatives were open to the student? to the teacher? to the other students?

APPENDIX

Graduation Day

Miss Jan Jordan attended Americus, Georgia High School for four years. Her graduation day was in June, 1964. Like other seniors, she invited her friends to the graduation. Unlike other seniors, some of her friends were Negroes.

When they arrived at the gate of the stadium, where the exercises were to be held, they were turned away by police and school authorities. After some efforts to negotiate, Jan, who was then in her cap and gown waiting for the procession to begin, was informed that her friends were not being admitted.

She then stepped out of line, walked to the head of it and said to the faculty member in charge: "I think my friends have as much right to come to my graduation as anyone else's friends do."

With this, she started walking towards the stands, where several thousand people were expectantly waiting for the procession to begin. They watched in amazement as this lone senior, followed by her father and kid brother (her mother stayed at the gate with those who had been barred), walked steadily toward them, slowly climbed to the top of the stands, and sat down. Then the other seniors marched out on the field and seated themselves on the platform facing the stands, and facing Jan and her father and brother. After speeches by honor students on "Moral Responsibility" and "Reverence" each graduate was called to the rostrum and given a diploma.

1. What do you think about what Jan Jordan did? Would you do it? Why? Why not?
2. What did she hope to accomplish? Was this a way to do it? What else might she have done?
3. Is there anything you want as badly as she wanted this? Would you be willing to risk your diploma for it? Explain.
4. There is more to the story: "Next day, because she felt that some might not have understood her strange action the night before, Jan placed an ad in the Americus paper. It was headed: "Why I Did Not Graduate with My Class at Americus High," and stated simply that because her friends were not admitted on the same basis as other's she felt unable to participate."
5. Does this story have any implications for your own life?

APPENDIX

Some Questions to Ponder While Viewing
"To All My Friends on Shore" (Bill Cosby Special)

1. What is life like in a low-income housing project?

2. What values were important to Blue, his wife, and Vandy at the beginning of the story?

3. Over what kinds of issues did their values come into direct conflict?

4. Why did Blue reject the numbers game or hustling as possible means for achieving his goals?

5. Were the values of Blue, his wife, and Vandy "realistic" in terms of their life circumstances? What factors operated for and against realization of Blue's "dream"?

6. What brought about a change in Blue's values? What does it take to change values?

7. How did the characters in the story acquire their values?

8. If you were one of the characters in the story how might you have tried to improve communication within the family?

9. With whose values do you feel the greatest sympathy? Why?

10. Where do you see yourself in terms of Blue's description of yesterday's, today's, and tomorrow's man?

11. What kinds of time - based value orientations are encouraged in our society by schools, churches, clubs, sales businesses, etc.?

12. How might you go about changing your own values or those of others?

APPENDIX

GOALS FOR PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

This form is to help you think about various aspects of your relationships with others and your skills in group situations. It gives you a chance to set your own goals for development. The steps in using it are:

1. Read through the list of activities and decide which ones you are doing right, which ones you should do more, and which ones you should do less. Mark each item in the appropriate place.
2. Some goals that are not listed may be more important to you than those listed. Write such goals on the blank lines.

	Doing all right	Need to do it more	Need to do it less	
Communication skills				
1. Amount of talking in group	_____	_____	_____	1.
2. Being brief and concise	_____	_____	_____	2.
3. Being forceful	_____	_____	_____	3.
4. Drawing others out	_____	_____	_____	4.
5. Listening alertly	_____	_____	_____	5.
6. Thinking before I talk	_____	_____	_____	6.
7. Keeping my remarks on the topic	_____	_____	_____	7.
8. _____	_____	_____	_____	8.
Observation skills				
1. Noting tension in group	_____	_____	_____	1.
2. Noting who talks to whom	_____	_____	_____	2.
3. Noting interest level of group	_____	_____	_____	3.
4. Sensing feelings of individuals	_____	_____	_____	4.
5. Noting who is being "left out"	_____	_____	_____	5.
6. Noting reaction to my comments	_____	_____	_____	6.
7. Noting when group avoids a topic	_____	_____	_____	7.
8. _____	_____	_____	_____	8.
Problem-solving skills				
1. Stating problems or goals	_____	_____	_____	1.
2. Asking for ideas, opinions	_____	_____	_____	2.
3. Giving ideas	_____	_____	_____	3.
4. Evaluating ideas critically	_____	_____	_____	4.
5. Summarizing discussion	_____	_____	_____	5.
6. Clarifying issues	_____	_____	_____	6.
7. _____	_____	_____	_____	7.

	Doing all right	Need to do it more	Need to do it less	
Morale-building skills				
1. Showing interest	_____	_____	_____	1.
2. Working to keep people from being ignored	_____	_____	_____	2.
3. Harmonizing, helping people reach agreement	_____	_____	_____	3.
4. Reducing tension	_____	_____	_____	4.
5. Upholding rights of individuals in the face of group pressure	_____	_____	_____	5.
6. Expressing praise or appreciation	_____	_____	_____	6.
7. _____	_____	_____	_____	7.
Emotional Expressiveness				
1. Telling others what I feel	_____	_____	_____	1.
2. Hiding my emotions	_____	_____	_____	2.
3. Disagreeing openly	_____	_____	_____	3.
4. Expressing warm feelings	_____	_____	_____	4.
5. Expressing Gratitude	_____	_____	_____	5.
6. Being sarcastic	_____	_____	_____	6.
7. _____	_____	_____	_____	7.
Ability to face and accept Emotional Situations				
1. Being able to face conflict, anger	_____	_____	_____	1.
2. Being able to face closeness, affection.	_____	_____	_____	2.
3. Being able to face disappointment	_____	_____	_____	3.
4. Being able to stand silence	_____	_____	_____	4.
5. Being able to stand tension	_____	_____	_____	5.
6. _____	_____	_____	_____	6.
Social Relationships				
1. Competing to outdo others	_____	_____	_____	1.
2. Acting dominant toward others	_____	_____	_____	2.
3. Trusting others	_____	_____	_____	3.
4. Being helpful	_____	_____	_____	4.
5. Being protective	_____	_____	_____	5.
6. Calling attention to one's self	_____	_____	_____	6.
7. Being able to stand up for myself	_____	_____	_____	7.
8. _____	_____	_____	_____	8.

General	Doing all right	Need to do it more	Need to do it less	
1. Understanding why I do what I do (insight)	_____	_____	_____	1.
2. Encouraging comments on my own behavior (feedback)	_____	_____	_____	2.
3. Accepting help willingly	_____	_____	_____	3.
4. Making my mind up firmly	_____	_____	_____	4.
5. Criticizing myself	_____	_____	_____	5.
6. Waiting patiently	_____	_____	_____	6.
7. Going off by myself to read or think	_____	_____	_____	7.
8. _____	_____	_____	_____	8.

APPENDIX

INDIVIDUAL

Experiment

I am ready to try that out
I've got an idea for a way we could test that
I wonder what would happen if ...
(Risk Taking)

INTERPERSONAL

Help others to experiment

Let's try it
Let's follow up on that suggestion
Let's explore the implications of that idea
(Encouragement, support of risk taking)

INDIVIDUAL

Open

I hadn't thought of it that way before
I see what you mean
Now that I think about it ...
(Permitting reception of new information, building on another's ideas)

INTERPERSONAL

Help others to be open

What if ... (providing new information)
What do you think about ... (suggesting a different point of view)
How does your point of view fit with Sam's
That pulls it all together
(Elicitation and support of expanded points of view)

APPENDIX

INDIVIDUAL

Owning

I think ...
I believe ...
I feel ...
In my opinion ...
(Statement of elaboration of ideas)

INTERPERSONAL

Help others to own

Why do you think so?
Tell me more about that
Let's check to see where we are
Does anyone else have suggestions?
Do you mean ...? That's a good idea.

INDIVIDUAL

Not owning

I have nothing to say (or refusal to express ideas)
I am not upset, excited, etc. (when shows signs of intense feeling)

INTERPERSONAL

Not help others to own

We don't want to hear what you think.
No! You're wrong
You couldn't believe that!
(Interrupting, cutting someone off, rejecting another's view as valid for him)

APPENDIX

INDIVIDUAL

Not open
I'm right!
I don't care what you think
I'm not changing my point of view and that's final
(refusal to consider new ideas or information)

INTERPERSONAL

Not help others to be open
Don't listen to him
His ideas are always ridiculous
That's not relevant to our discussion
So and so (an authority) will straighten you out
(restricting the expansion of individual or group views, appeal to authority for best solution)

INDIVIDUAL

Reject experimenting
I refuse to participate
Going out on a limb is foolish

INTERPERSONAL

Not help others experiment
Don't try it
It isn't worth the risk
Don't say anything you'd be sorry for later.